

The rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In rejecting claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Examiner alleges "In claim 1, ... the 'display set part', ... the 'setting signal' and ... the 'set signal' are not supported in the specification." The Examiner then states "The specification does mention 'input timing set data' on page 9, line 30; however, there is no mention of the above items" and concludes "... 'set data' does not support the 'display standard set part', 'setting signal' and 'set signal' in the claim 1."

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to M.P.E.P § 2163.02, stating "Whenever the issue arises, the fundamental factual inquiry is whether a claim defines an invention that is clearly conveyed to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was filed. The subject matter of the claim need not be described literally (i.e., using the same terms...) in order for the disclosure to satisfy the description requirement." Further, M.P.E.P § 2163.04 states "The Examiner has the initial burden of presenting evidence or reasons why persons skilled in the art would not recognize in an applicant's disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims."

Applicant respectfully submits that, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that, for example, at page 9, lines 23-32, the claimed subject matter at issue is clearly described. Further, Applicant respectfully submits one of ordinary skill in the art would be enabled to make and use the claimed invention by reading the disclosure of the application. Lastly, in stating " ... 'set data' does not support the 'display standard set part', 'setting signal' and 'set signal' in the claim 1", Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case for noncompliance under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first

paragraph, because the Examiner has not provided any reasons why persons skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would not have recognized the description of these limitations in the disclosure of the application as filed (see M.P.E.P. § 2163.04). For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1-5 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applicant believes the application to be in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner deem that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Respectfully submitted,

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

Date: December 31, 2002

By Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No: 41,786

Kurt M. Eaton
Registration No: 51,640

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 496-7500
Facsimile: (202) 496-7756

